

Continual Learning in Task-Oriented Dialogue Systems

Andrea Madotto*, Zhaojiang Lin*, Zhenpeng Zhou†, Seungwhan Moon†,
Paul Crook†, Bing Liu†, Zhou Yu†, Eunjoon Cho†, Zhiguang Wang†

*The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology

†Facebook

{amadotto, zlinao}@connect.ust.hk

{zzp, shanemoon, pacrook, bingl, zhoujoyu, zgwang}@fb.com

Abstract

Continual learning in task-oriented dialogue systems can allow us to add new domains and functionalities through time without incurring the high cost of a whole system retraining. In this paper, we propose a continual learning benchmark for task-oriented dialogue systems with 37 domains to be learned continuously in four settings, such as intent recognition, state tracking, natural language generation, and end-to-end. Moreover, we implement and compare multiple existing continual learning baselines, and we propose a simple yet effective architectural method based on residual adapters. Our experiments demonstrate that the proposed architectural method and a simple replay-based strategy perform comparably well but they both achieve inferior performance to the multi-task learning baseline, in where all the data are shown at once, showing that continual learning in task-oriented dialogue systems is a challenging task. Furthermore, we reveal several trade-off between different continual learning methods in term of parameter usage and memory size, which are important in the design of a task-oriented dialogue system. The proposed benchmark is released together with several baselines to promote more research in this direction.

1 Introduction

Task-oriented dialogue systems (ToDs) are the core technology of the current state-of-the-art smart assistant (e.g. Alexa, Siri, Portal etc.). These systems are either modularized, Natural Language Understanding (NLU), Dialogue State Tracking (DST), Dialogue Policy (DP) and Natural Language Generation (NLG), or end-to-end, where a single model implicitly learn how to issue APIs (i.e., NLU+DST) and system responses (i.e., NLG).




Figure 1: In Continual Learning, the model is trained one dataset at the time. In this instance, the model is first trained on data from the hotel domain D_{Hotel} then on the Taxi D_{Taxi} and so on. The parameter of the model is updated sequentially based on the loss function L .

These systems are often updated with new features based on the user needs, e.g., adding new slots and intents, or even completely new domains. However, existing dialogue models are trained with the assumption of having a fixed dataset at the beginning of the training, and they are not designed to add new domains and functionalities through time, without incurring the high cost of a whole system retraining. Therefore, the ability to acquire new knowledge continuously, a.k.a. Continual Learning (CL) (Thrun and Pratt, 2012), is crucial in the design of a dialogue system. Figure 1 shows an high-level intuition of CL in ToDs.

In this setting the main challenge is catastrophic forgetting (McCloskey and Cohen, 1989). This phenomena happens since there is a distributional shift between the tasks in the curriculum which leads to catastrophic forgetting the previously acquired knowledge. To overcome this challenge three kind of methods are usually deployed such as loss *regularization*, for avoiding to interfere with the previously learned task, *rehearsal*, which uses an episodic memory to recall previously learned tasks, and *architectural*, which adds task-specific parameters for each learned task. However, architectural methods are usually not considered as a baseline, especially in sequence-to-sequence gener-

* Work done during internship at Facebook




Figure 2: Example of input-out pairs, for the four settings, INTENT, DST, NLG and end-to-end (E2E).

ation tasks (Sun et al., 2019), because they usually *require a further step* during testing for selecting which parameter to use for the given task.

To the best of our knowledge, Continual Learning (CL) in task-oriented dialogue systems (Lee, 2017) is mostly unexplored or it has been studied in specific settings (e.g. NLG (Mi et al., 2020)) using only few tasks learned continuously. Given the importance of the task in the dialogue setting, we believe that a more comprehensive investigation is required, especially by comparing multiple settings and baselines. Therefore in this paper:

1. we propose a benchmark for Continual Learning in ToDs, with 37 tasks to be learned continuously on 4 settings,
2. we propose a simple yet effective architectural CL method based on residual adapters (Houlsby et al., 2019) that can continuously learn tasks without the need of a task classifier at testing time, and
3. we analyse the trade-off between performance, number-of-parameters, and episodic memories sizes of the three main categories of CL methods (i.e., Regularization, Rehearsal, Architectural).

In Section 2 we introduce the basic concepts and notation used throughout the paper, for both task-oriented dialogue modelling and continual learning, in Section 3 we introduce the proposed architectural CL method, in Section 4 we describe datasets, baselines, evaluation metrics and experimental settings, and Section 5 we describe the main findings of the paper.

2 Background

2.1 Task-Oriented Dialogue Modelling

In this paper, we model task-oriented dialogue systems as a seq2seq generation task (Lei et al., 2018; Byrne et al., 2020) that generates both api-calls and

responses. As shown in Figure 2, the model uses the dialogue history to generate an api-call, which is the concatenation of the user intent plus the current dialogue state and then uses its return, which can be empty or the system speech-act, to generate the system response. This modelling choice is guided by the existing annotated dialogue datasets, which provide the intent and the dialogue state of the user at every turn, and the speech-act of the system; and it allows us to define four distinct settings for studying continual learning such as Intent Recognition (INTENT), Dialogue State Tracking (DST), Natural Language Generation (NLG) and end-to-end (E2E). In the coming paragraphs, we will formally describe the four settings as different input-out pairs for a seq2seq model.

Data-Formatting Let us define the dialogue history H as a single sequence of tokens from the concatenation of the alternating utterances from the user and the system turns respectively. Without loss of generality, we assume that H has all the dialogue history without the last system utterance denoted as S . For distinguishing between speakers, we add two special tokens at the beginning of every utterance i.e., **USER**: for the user utterance and **SYSTEM**: for the system utterance. Then, we define an api-call, denoted by S_{API} , as the concatenation of the api-name, i.e., the user-intent, and its arguments, i.e., slot-value pairs from the DST. The following syntax is used:

$$X_{API} = \underbrace{\mathbf{I}}_{\text{Intent}} \underbrace{(s_1 = v_1, \dots, s_k = v_p)}_{\text{Slot-value pairs}} \quad (1)$$

where $\mathbf{I}$ is an intent or the api-name, s_i the slot-name and v_i one of the possible values for the slot s_i . The return of the api-call is either an empty string, thus the model uses the dialogue history to generate a response, or a speech-act, denoted as S_{OUT} , in the same format as the api-call in Equation 1. Similar to the dialogue history, we define two special tokens **API**: and **OUT**: for triggering the model to generate the api-call and for distinguishing the return of the api from the dialogue history respectively. Based on this pre-processing, we define the four settings used in this paper.

Without loss of generality, we define the three modularized settings by their input-out pairs:

$$\begin{array}{ll}
H \rightarrow \mathbf{I} & (\text{INTENT}) \\
H \rightarrow \mathbf{I}(s_1 = v_1, \dots, s_k = v_p) & (\text{DST}) \\
\underbrace{\mathbf{I}(s_1 = v_1, \dots, s_k = v_p)}_{S_{OUT}} \rightarrow S & (\text{NLG})
\end{array}$$

where instead the end-to-end (E2E) setting as the pairs:

$$\begin{array}{l}
H \rightarrow \underbrace{\mathbf{I}(s_1 = v_1, \dots, s_k = v_p)}_{S_{API}} \\
H + \underbrace{\mathbf{I}(s_1 = v_1, \dots, s_k = v_p)}_{S_{OUT}} \rightarrow S
\end{array}$$

Often, S_{OUT} is empty and thus the model is though to map the dialogue history to the response directly ($H \rightarrow S$). An example of input-out pairs is shown in Figure 2.

Finally, we define a dialogue dataset as $D_K = \{(X_i, Y_i)\}_i^n$, where (X_i, Y_i) is a general input-out pair from one of the four settings in consideration, and K the dialogue domain under consideration (e.g., Hotel).

Model In this paper, we employ a decoder-only Language Models (e.g. GPT-2), which is inline with the current state-of-the-art task-oriented dialogue models Peng et al. (2020); Hosseini-Asl et al. (2020). Then, given the concatenation of the input $X = \{x_0, \dots, x_n\}$ and output $Y = \{x_{n+1}, \dots, x_m\}$ sequences, we compute the conditional language model distribution using the chain rule of probability (Bengio et al., 2003) as:

$$p_\theta(X|Y) = \prod_{i=0}^{n+m} p_\theta(x_i|x_0, \dots, x_{i-1}). \quad (2)$$

where θ are the model parameters. The model’s parameters are trained to minimize the negative log-likelihood over a dataset D of input-out pairs, which in our case is the data of the four settings. Formally, we define the loss $\mathcal{L}_\theta$ as:

$$\mathcal{L}_\theta(D) = - \sum_j^{|D|} \sum_{i=0}^{n+m} \log p_\theta(x_i^{(j)}|x_0^{(j)}, \dots, x_{i-1}^{(j)}), \quad (3)$$

where $n + m$ is a maximum sequence length in D . At inference time, given the input sequence X , the model parametrized by θ autoregressively generate the output sequence Y .

2.2 Continual Learning

The aim of Continual Learning (CL) is to learn a set of tasks sequentially without catastrophically forgetting previously learned ones. In task-oriented dialogue systems, we cast CL as learning a sequence of domains sequentially. Let us define a curriculum of T domains as the ordered set $\mathcal{D} = \{D_1, \dots, D_T\}$, where D_k is a dataset under the domain K . Moreover, we denote the models’ parameter after learning the task K with θ_K .

Following the recently defined taxonomy for CL (Wortsman et al., 2020), we study the settings in where the task-id is provided during training, but not during testing¹. Meaning, during training the model is aware of which domain is currently learning, but during testing, the model is evaluated **without** specifying the dialogue domain. This assumption makes our CL setting more challenging but more realist, since during testing the users do not explicitly specify in which domain they want to operate.

In this paper, we consider three Continual Learning approaches: *regularization*, *rehearsal* and *architectural*. In our experiments, we describe the most commonly used methods for each approach, especially the one known to work well in language tasks. Thus:

- *Regularization* methods add a regularization term to the current learned θ_t for avoiding to interfere with the previously learned once θ_{t-1} . Formally the loss at task t is:

$$L_{\theta_t}(D_t) = L_{\theta_t}(D_t) + \lambda \Omega(\theta_t - \theta_{t-1}^*)^2 \quad (4)$$

where θ_{t-1}^* are a copy of the previously learned parameters frozen at this stage. In our experiments, we consider two kind of Ω : the identity function (**L2**), and the fisher information matrix (Kirkpatrick et al., 2017) (**EWC**).

- *Rehearsal* methods uses an episodic memory $\mathcal{M}$ to store examples from the previously learned domains, and re-use them while learning new tasks. The most straightforward methods is to add the content of the memory $\mathcal{M}$ to the current task data D_t . Following our notation, the model is optimized using $L_{\theta_t}(D_t + \mathcal{M})$, and we refer to this method as **REPLAY**. Another rehearsal method is to

¹GNs: Task Given during train, Not inference; shared labels

constrain the gradients updates so that the loss of the samples in memory never increases. More formally:

$$L_{\theta_t}(D_t) \text{ s.t. } L_{\theta_t}(\mathcal{M}) \leq L_{\theta_{t-1}}(\mathcal{M}) \quad (5)$$

Of this kind, Gradient Episodic Memory (GEM) (Lopez-Paz and Ranzato, 2017) compute the gradient constrain via a quadratic programming solver that scales with the number of parameters of the model. After a first investigation, we discover that is impractical for large-language model to use GEM, since they have millions of parameters and the constrain is computed for each batch. To cope with this computational complexity, Chaudhry et al. (2018) proposed **A-GEM** that efficiently compute the gradient constrains while being effective in CL tasks. Finally, a rehearsal method specific to language is **LAMOL** (Sun et al., 2019) which instead of storing samples in $\mathcal{M}$, learn a model that simultaneously learns to solve the tasks and generate training samples.

- *Architectural* methods add task-specific parameters to an existing base model for each task. Of this kind, multiple models has been proposed such as Progressive Net (Rusu et al., 2016), Dynamically Expandable Networks (DEN) (Yoon et al., 2017) and Learn-to-Grow (Li et al., 2019b). On the other hand, there are fixed capacity methods, that do not add specific parameters but they learn parameters-masks (Fernando et al., 2017), usually binary (Mallya et al., 2018), to select sub-networks that are task-specific. To the best of our knowledge, these models have been tested mostly on computer vision tasks, and they can not easily handle our continual learning settings (i.e., no task-id during testing).

3 AdapterCL

Motivated by the lack of architectural baselines for CL in sequence-to-sequence modelling, we propose a novel architectural method called AdapterCL. Our proposed method parameterizes each task using Residual Adapters (Houlsby et al., 2019) and uses an entropy-based classifier to select which adapter to use at testing time. This method is designed for large pre-trained language models, e.g. GPT-2, since only the task-specific parameter are trained while the original weights are left frozen.




Figure 3: High-level representation of the AdapterCL.

Residual adapters are trainable parameters added on top of each transformer layer, which steer the output distribution of a pre-trained model without modifying its original weights. An adapter block consists of a Layer Normalization (Ba et al., 2016), followed by a two linear layer (Hinton and Zemel, 1994) with a residual connection. Given the hidden representation at layer l denoted as $H \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times d}$ of a transformer (Vaswani et al., 2017), where d is the hidden size and p is the sequence length, the residual adapter computes:

$$\text{Adapter}_{\mu_i^l}(H) = \text{ReLU}(\text{LN}(x)W_l^E)W_l^D + H, \quad (6)$$

where W_l^E and W_l^D are trainable parameters of dimensions $d \times b$ and $b \times d$ respectively, and $\text{LN}(\cdot)$ denotes the layer normalization. The bottleneck dimension b is a tunable hyper-parameter that allows to adjust the capacity of the adapter according to the complexity of the target task. We define the set of $\mu_i = \{W_0^E, W_0^D, \dots, W_L^E, W_L^D\}$ as the set of parameters for the Adapter $_i$ for a model with L layers.

To continuously learning new tasks, we first spawn a new Adapter, parameterized by μ , and then we train its parameters as in Equation 3. For instance, given the dataset D_t and the model with its corresponding Adapter μ_t , the loss is defined as:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mu_t}(D_t) = - \sum_j \sum_{i=0}^{|D_t|n+m} \log p_{\mu_t}(x_i | x_0, \dots, x_{i-1}) \quad (7)$$

Importantly, the loss is optimized over μ_t to guarantee that each task is independently learned. An high-level representation of AdapterCL is shown in Figure 3.

Perplexity-Based Classifier In our CL setting the task-id is provided during training, thus each

Name	Train	Valid	Test	Dom.	Intent	Turns
TM19	4,403	551	553	6	112	19.97
TM20	13,839	1,731	1,734	7	128	16.92
MWoz	7,906	1,000	1,000	5	15	13.93
SGD	5,278	761	1,531	19	43	14.71
Total	31,426	4,043	4,818	37	280	16.23

Table 1: Main datasets statistics.

μ_t is optimized over D_t . During testing, instead, the task-id is not provided, thus the model has to predict which adapter to use for accomplishing the task. This step is not required in regularization and rehearsal approaches since a single set of parameters is optimised during training.

Inspired by Wortsman et al. (2020), we propose to utilize the perplexity of each adapter over the input X as a measure of uncertainty. Thus, by selecting the adapter with lowest perplexity, we select the most confident model to generate the output sequence. The perplexity of an input sequence $X = x_0, \dots, x_n$ is defined as:

$$\text{PPL}_\theta(X) = \sqrt[n]{\prod_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{p_\theta(x_i | x_0, \dots, x_{i-1})}} \quad (8)$$

Therefore, given the set of adapters parametrized by $\mu_0, \dots, \mu_N$, each of which trained respectively with $D_0, \dots, D_N$, and an input sample X , we compute:

$$\alpha_t = \text{PPL}_{\mu_t}(X) \quad \forall t \in 1, \dots, N, \quad (9)$$

in where each α_t represent the confidence of the adapter t for the input X . The task-id t is thus selected as

$$t^* = \text{argmin } \alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_N \quad (10)$$

The perplexity-based selector requires a linear number of forwards with respect to the number of Adapters (Equation 9), but it has the advantage of not requiring a further classifier, which itself would suffer from catastrophic forgetting and would require an episodic memory.

4 Experimental Settings

In this sections we describe 1) the datasets used for creating the learning curriculum, 2) the evaluation metric used to evaluate the different settings, and 3) the experimental setups.

4.1 Datasets

To the best of our knowledge, there is no benchmark for CL in dialogue systems with a high number of tasks to be learned continuously and with multiple training settings. The closest to our is the work is from Mi et al. (2020), which continuously learn 5 domains in the NLG settings. In general, NLP benchmarks for continual learning uses no more than 10 tasks (Sun et al., 2019; d’Autume et al., 2019). Consequently, in this paper we propose a Continual Learning benchmark by jointly pre-processing four task-oriented dataset such as Task-Master 2019 (TM19) (Byrne et al., 2019), Task-Master 2020 (TM20) (Byrne et al., 2019), Schema Guided Dialogue (SGD) (Rastogi et al., 2019) and MultiWoZ (Budzianowski et al., 2018). This results in a curriculum of 37 domains to be learned continuously under four setting such as INTENT classification, DST, NLG, and E2E. This has been possible because the four datasets provides the speech-act annotation for both the user and the system turns, and the dialogue-state as well. For avoiding any domain overlapping, we select only the dialogues with a single domain and we do not merge domains with similar/same names or semantics. For example, the *restaurant* domain appears in TM19, TM20 and MWOZ, with different slot names and values. Thus, we intentionally keep these data samples separate for modelling scenarios in which multiple apis are available for the same domain.

Finally, the dataset are pre-processed as in Section 2.1 to form the four tasks, and the main statistics are shown in Table 1. In appendix, Table 5 we report the number of sample by domain and setting, where we can notice how different domains have a much different sample size, from few-hundred samples (e.g., SGD-travel) to 15K (e.g., TM19-flight). Importantly, since not all the datasets provides a delexicalized version of the responses, we decide to keep all the dataset in their plain text form.

4.2 Evaluation Metric

Automatic evaluations for end-to-end task-oriented dialogue systems is challenging, especially for the response generation. To overcome this issue, in this paper we use well-defined metric based on the three modularized settings. In each of the three sub-tasks, we define four metric as following:

- *INTENT* recognition is evaluated using the *accuracy* between the generated intent and

			INTENT	DST	NLG	
Method	+Param.	Mem.	Accuracy $\uparrow$	JGA $\uparrow$	EER $\downarrow$	BLEU $\uparrow$
<i>VANILLA</i>	-	$\emptyset$	4.08 ± 1.4	4.91 ± 4.46	48.73 ± 3.81	6.38 ± 0.6
<i>L2</i>	$ \theta $	$\emptyset$	3.74 ± 1.4	3.81 ± 3.44	55.68 ± 7.09	5.4 ± 0.9
<i>EWC</i>	$2 \theta $	$\emptyset$	3.95 ± 1.3	5.22 ± 4.46	58.2 ± 3.66	5.06 ± 0.5
<i>AGEM</i>	-	$t M $	34.04 ± 6.36	6.37 ± 4.0	62.09 ± 6.88	4.54 ± 0.6
<i>LAMOL</i>	-	$\emptyset$	7.49 ± 6.35	4.55 ± 3.48	66.11 ± 6.97	3.0 ± 0.9
<i>REPLAY</i>	-	$t M $	81.08 ± 1.37	30.33 ± 1.24	17.72 ± 0.85	17.4 ± 0.68
<i>ADAPT</i>	$t \mu $	$\emptyset$	90.46 ± 0.6	35.06 ± 0.52	31.78 ± 1.28	16.76 ± 0.34
<i>MULTI</i>	-	-	95.45 ± 0.1	48.9 ± 0.2	12.56 ± 0.2	23.61 ± 0.1

Table 2: E2E results in term of Intent accuracy, Joint-Goal-Accuracy (JGA), Slot-Error-Rate (EER) and BLUE. +Param shows the additional number of parameters per task, and Mem the episodic memory size need per task.

the one provided in the gold label.

- *DST* is evaluated with the Joint Goal Accuracy (JGA) (Wu et al., 2019) over the gold dialogue state.
- *NLG* is evaluated using both the BLEU score (Papineni et al., 2002) and the slot error rate (EER) (Wen et al., 2015) which computed by ratio between the total number of slots and the values not appearing in the response. In datasets such as SGD, the slot has binary values e.g., yes or no, and thus we exclude those from the count as in Kale and Rastogi (2020). In the E2E setting, if the api output (X_{out}) is empty, then we rely on the BLEU score.

Independently from the metric, we compute continual learning specific metrics such as the average metric thought time (Avg. Metric) as in Lopez-Paz and Ranzato (2017). We consider access to the test set for each of the T tasks and after the model finishes learning the task t_i , we evaluate the model test performance on all tasks in the curriculum. By doing so, we construct the matrix $R \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times T}$, where $R_{i,j}$ is the test metric (e.g., BLEU, JGA) of the model on task t_j after observing the last sample from task t_i . Then we define the average accuracy as:

$$\text{Avg.Metric} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^T R_{T,i} \quad (11)$$

The Avg. Metric score is useful for understanding the learning dynamics thought time of different baselines. Further metrics such as Backward-Transfer and Forward-Transfer (Lopez-Paz and Ranzato, 2017) are available to distinguish baselines with similar Avg. Metric score, but in this paper we limit our evaluation to this metric, since there is a large gap among different baselines. Fi-

nally, to evaluate the adapter selection, we use the accuracy over the gold task-id.

4.3 Baselines and Settings

The main aim of this paper is to compare the performance of different CL approaches and to understand what are the trade-off among them. Therefore, following the definition provided in Section 2.2, we compare: 1) EWC and L2, 2) A-GEM, LAMOL, and REPLAY, and 3) AdapterCL. Additionally, we provide a baselines trained on the task continuously, namely VANILLA, without any regularization or memory, and a multitask baseline (MULTI), which is trained on all the data in the curriculum at the same time. In L2, EWC, and A-GEM we tune different λ in the range 0.0001 to 100, and in *rehearsal* based methods, such as REPLAY and GEM, we keep 50 samples per task, for a total of 1850 sample in $\mathcal{M}$ at the end of the curriculum. This is particularly important since if we store in memory all the samples of the seen tasks the model require an high training cost. Arguably, this could be an option if the per-task sample size is small, but this is not always possible as in large language models (Brown et al., 2020). Therefore the assumption of minimizing the number of samples in memory is valid and widely used in the CL literature (Mi et al., 2020). Finally, for the AdapterCL, we tune the bottleneck size b between 10, 50, 100, 200. Interested readers can refer to appendix for further details. In Continual Learning the model is not able decide the order of tasks, therefore, we create 5 learning curriculum by randomly permuting the 37 tasks.




Figure 4: Avg. Metric for the Intent Accuracy and EER in the E2E setting.

5 Results & Analysis

The main results in the end-to-end setting are summarized in Table 2, while the one from the modularized settings in Table 3 in the Appendix. In these tables we report the Avg. Metric at the end of the curriculum, which is equivalent to the average test set performance in all the tasks, and the resources used by each model.

Main Results From these tables, we can observe that: 1) both regularization-based methods (L2/EWC) and some rehearsal-based methods (AGEM/LAMOL) suffers greatly in this task, 2) REPLAY and AdapterCL perform comparably well in the Intent and DST metric, 3) REPLAY works the best in the NLG task, showing that transferring learning between tasks is needed, and 4) no CL methods can reach the multi-task baseline, especially in the DST task. Moreover, the adapter selection accuracy based on Equation 10, is of $95.44 \pm 0.2\%$ in end-to-end, $98.03 \pm 0.1\%$ in Intent Recognition, $98.19 \pm 0.1\%$ in DST, and $93.98 \pm 0.1\%$.

Although these numbers are meaningful, they do not describe the entire learning history of the curriculum. To better understand this dynamics,

we plot the Avg. Metric in Equation 11 after each task is learned (i.e. $t=T$ in the equation). Figure 4 shows the plot for the two of the considered metrics and all the baselines. From this figure we can better understand how REPLAY and AdapterCL outperforms other baselines and, interestingly, that LAMOL performs as well as replay in the first 12 tasks. This because LAMOL learns to generate training samples instead of using an explicit memory, and thus the generation become harder when more and more task are shown. This further strength our motivation for having a benchmark with a long curriculum. In Appendix, Figure 6 shows the remain two metrics for the E2E setting and Figure 7 show the same plots for the individual modules training.

5.1 No Free Lunch

Finally based on the results shown in Table 2, especially based on the resource used by each methods, we conclude that there is a no free lunch in term of resources needed for avoiding the catastrophic problem. To elaborate, in both REPLAY and AdapterCL the resource used grows linearly with the number of tasks, i.e., in REPLAY the number of samples stored in the episodic memory grows linearly (i.e., 50 times the number of tasks), and in AdapterCL the number of parameters grows linearly (i.e., number of adapter parameter times the number of tasks). Figure 10 in Appendix describe an high-level intuition of this concept by plotting the number of tasks vs parameter and episodic memory size.

Therefore, given a resource budget, in term of memory or parameters, different baselines are preferable. The main advantage of using memory-base (e.g., REPLAY) that no parameters are added thus the resulting model is closer to a multitask baseline, but it comes with the disadvantage of losing the weights of the original pre-trained model. This is particularly critical for large pre-trained LMs which provide a good starting points for fine-tuning new tasks. On the other hand, the main advantage of parameters isolation methods (e.g., AdapterCL) is the ability to retaining the original weights and the ability of controlling which task to trigger given a certain input. The latter is important in scenarios where just a subset of domains are shown to the user (e.g. only one particular restaurant api). The main disadvantage, instead, is the lack of knowledge transfer among tasks, since each




Figure 5: Ablation study on the size of the episodic-memory vs JGA.

dataset is trained in isolation.

5.2 Analysis: Episodic Memory Size

In this section, we analyse the effect of increasing the episodic memory size for the REPLAY method. Trivially, by including all the training sample in the memory, the model at the last task converges to the multitask baseline. Then, the question of how many samples to keep per task for avoiding catastrophic forgetting is important. In light of this, Figure 5 shows the performance of different Episodic Memory size in the DST task. Here we observe that by storing only few samples per task (i.e., 10-50) the model still greatly suffers from catastrophic forgetting, where instead with around 500 samples, which is equivalent to a total of 18,500 sample in our setting, the performance are closer to the multitask baseline (i.e., a possible upper bound). Similar observation are shown for the other two tasks Figure 8-9 in Appendix.

6 Related Work

Continual Learning methods are usually developed and benchmark on computer vision tasks. Interested readers may refer to Mundt et al. (2020); Parisi et al. (2019); De Lange et al. (2019) for an overview of existing approaches, and to Section 2.2 for more details on the three main CL approaches studied in this paper. On the other hand, Continual Learning is also studied in the Long Life Learning (LLL) scenario, where a learner continuously accumulate knowledge and makes use of it in the future (Chen and Liu, 2018; Liu and Mei, 2020). In this paper, we study the setting in where a series of task are learned continuously.

Continual Learning in NLP has been explored in both in classification (d’Áutume et al., 2019; Sprechmann et al., 2018; Wang et al., 2020) and generation (Sun et al., 2019; Hu et al., 2020) tasks. For instance, Sun et al. (2019); Chuang et al. (2020) proposed LAMOL, which we use as our baselines, and studied its effectiveness in a subset of DecaNLP (McCann et al., 2018). On the other hand, the work of d’Áutume et al. (2019); Sprechmann et al. (2018) are not suitable for interactive systems as dialogue systems, since they require a local adaptation (i.e., a fine-tuning step) during inference. Finally, continual learning has been used for sentence encoder (Liu et al., 2019), composition language learning (Li et al., 2019c) and relation learning (Han et al., 2020). However, these methods are very specific to particular NLP applications.

Continual Learning in Dialogue Systems The very early work on CL for Task-Oriented dialogue is from Lee (2017), where EWC is used to avoid catastrophic forgetting on three domains learned sequentially. Continual Learning has been studied in the NLG setting, where a single model is trained to learn one domain at the time in MWoZ (Mi et al., 2020). The author, used an episodic memory to replay the example in combination with EWC. In this paper, we compare similar baselines, in a large benchmark that also include MWoZ and the NLG settings. Continual Learning has been studied also in the DST setting in (Wu et al., 2019) using MWoZ, where several baselines such as L2, EWC and GEM has been compared. Differently, (Li et al., 2019a) leverage CL for evaluate the quality of chat-bot models and He et al. (2019) studied the catastrophic forgetting problem in Chit-Chat systems. Finally, (Shuster et al., 2020) showed that by training models on humans-machine conversations in an open-domain fantasy world game (Fan et al., 2020) the models progressively improve, as measured by automatic metrics and online engagement scores.

7 Conclusion

In this paper, we proposed a benchmark for Continual Learning in task-oriented dialogue systems, with 37 tasks to be learned continuously on four settings such as Intent recognition, Dialogue State Tracking, Natural Language Generation, and end-to-end. Then, we implemented three different Continual Learning methodologies such as regularization, rehearsal and architectural. In the latter, we

propose a simple yet effective methods based on residual adapters and uses an entropy-based classifier to select which adapter to use at testing time. Finally, we analyse the trade-off between performance, number-of-parameters, and episodic memories size of the evaluated baselines, unveiling a no-free lunch among this methods.

References

- Jimmy Lei Ba, Jamie Ryan Kiros, and Geoffrey E Hinton. 2016. Layer normalization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1607.06450*.
- Yoshua Bengio, Réjean Ducharme, Pascal Vincent, and Christian Jauvin. 2003. A neural probabilistic language model. *Journal of machine learning research*, 3(Feb):1137–1155.
- Tom B Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. 2020. Language models are few-shot learners. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.14165*.
- Paweł Budzianowski, Tsung-Hsien Wen, Bo-Hsiang Tseng, Iñigo Casanueva, Ultes Stefan, Ramadan Osman, and Milica Gašić. 2018. Multiwoz - a large-scale multi-domain wizard-of-oz dataset for task-oriented dialogue modelling. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*.
- Bill Byrne, Karthik Krishnamoorthi, Saravanan Ganesh, and Mihir Sanjay Kale. 2020. Tickettalk: Toward human-level performance with end-to-end, transaction-based dialog systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.12458*.
- Bill Byrne, Karthik Krishnamoorthi, Chinnadhurai Sankar, Arvind Neelakantan, Daniel Duckworth, Semih Yavuz, Ben Goodrich, Amit Dubey, Kyu-Young Kim, and Andy Cedilnik. 2019. Taskmaster-1: toward a realistic and diverse dialog dataset. In *2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing*, Hong Kong.
- Arslan Chaudhry, Marc’Aurelio Ranzato, Marcus Rohrbach, and Mohamed Elhoseiny. 2018. Efficient lifelong learning with a-gem. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1812.00420*.
- Zhiyuan Chen and Bing Liu. 2018. Lifelong machine learning. *Synthesis Lectures on Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning*, 12(3):1–207.
- Yung-Sung Chuang, Shang-Yu Su, and Yun-Nung Chen. 2020. Lifelong language knowledge distillation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.02123*.
- Cyprien de Masson d’Autume, Sebastian Ruder, Lingpeng Kong, and Dani Yogatama. 2019. Episodic memory in lifelong language learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.01076*.
- Matthias De Lange, Rahaf Aljundi, Marc Masana, Sarah Parisot, Xu Jia, Aleš Leonardis, Gregory Slabaugh, and Tinne Tuytelaars. 2019. A continual learning survey: Defying forgetting in classification tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.08383*.
- Angela Fan, Jack Urbanek, Pratik Ringshia, Emily Dinan, Emma Qian, Siddharth Karamcheti, Shrimai Prabhumoye, Douwe Kiela, Tim Rocktäschel, Arthur Szlam, et al. 2020. Generating interactive worlds with text. In *AAAI*, pages 1693–1700.
- Chrisantha Fernando, Dylan Banarse, Charles Blundell, Yori Zwols, David Ha, Andrei A Rusu, Alexander Pritzel, and Daan Wierstra. 2017. Pathnet: Evolution channels gradient descent in super neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1701.08734*.
- Xu Han, Yi Dai, Tianyu Gao, Yankai Lin, Zhiyuan Liu, Peng Li, Maosong Sun, and Jie Zhou. 2020. Continual relation learning via episodic memory activation and reconsolidation. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 6429–6440.
- Tianxing He, Jun Liu, Kyunghyun Cho, Myle Ott, Bing Liu, James Glass, and Fuchun Peng. 2019. Mix-review: Alleviate forgetting in the pretrain-finetune framework for neural language generation models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.07117*.
- Geoffrey E Hinton and Richard S Zemel. 1994. Autoencoders, minimum description length and helmholtz free energy. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 3–10.
- Ehsan Hosseini-Asl, Bryan McCann, Chien-Sheng Wu, Semih Yavuz, and Richard Socher. 2020. A simple language model for task-oriented dialogue. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.00796*.
- Neil Houlsby, Andrei Giurgiu, Stanislaw Jastrzebski, Bruna Morrone, Quentin De Laroussilhe, Andrea Gesmundo, Mona Attariyan, and Sylvain Gelly. 2019. Parameter-efficient transfer learning for nlp. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1902.00751*.
- Hexiang Hu, Ozan Sener, Fei Sha, and Vladlen Koltun. 2020. Drinking from a firehose: Continual learning with web-scale natural language. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.09335*.
- Mihir Kale and Abhinav Rastogi. 2020. Few-shot natural language generation by rewriting templates. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.15006*.
- James Kirkpatrick, Razvan Pascanu, Neil Rabinowitz, Joel Veness, Guillaume Desjardins, Andrei A Rusu, Kieran Milan, John Quan, Tiago Ramalho, Agnieszka Grabska-Barwinska, et al. 2017. Overcoming catastrophic forgetting in neural networks.

- Proceedings of the national academy of sciences*, 114(13):3521–3526.
- Sungjin Lee. 2017. Toward continual learning for conversational agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1712.09943*.
- Wenqiang Lei, Xisen Jin, Min-Yen Kan, Zhaochun Ren, Xiangnan He, and Dawei Yin. 2018. Sequicity: Simplifying task-oriented dialogue systems with single sequence-to-sequence architectures. In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1437–1447.
- Lu Li, Zhongheng He, Xiangyang Zhou, and Dianhai Yu. 2019a. How to evaluate the next system: Automatic dialogue evaluation from the perspective of continual learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.04664*.
- Xilai Li, Yingbo Zhou, Tianfu Wu, Richard Socher, and Caiming Xiong. 2019b. Learn to grow: A continual structure learning framework for overcoming catastrophic forgetting. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.00310*.
- Yuanpeng Li, Liang Zhao, Kenneth Church, and Mohamed Elhoseiny. 2019c. Compositional language continual learning. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Bing Liu and Chuhe Mei. 2020. Lifelong knowledge learning in rule-based dialogue systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.09811*.
- Tianlin Liu, Lyle Ungar, and João Sedoc. 2019. Continual learning for sentence representations using conceptors. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.09187*.
- David Lopez-Paz and Marc’Aurelio Ranzato. 2017. Gradient episodic memory for continual learning. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 6467–6476.
- Arun Mallya, Dillon Davis, and Svetlana Lazebnik. 2018. Piggyback: Adapting a single network to multiple tasks by learning to mask weights. In *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, pages 67–82.
- Bryan McCann, Nitish Shirish Keskar, Caiming Xiong, and Richard Socher. 2018. The natural language decathlon: Multitask learning as question answering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1806.08730*.
- Michael McCloskey and Neal J Cohen. 1989. Catastrophic interference in connectionist networks: The sequential learning problem. In *Psychology of learning and motivation*, volume 24, pages 109–165. Elsevier.
- Fei Mi, Liangwei Chen, Mengjie Zhao, Minlie Huang, and Boi Faltings. 2020. Continual learning for natural language generation in task-oriented dialog systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.00910*.
- Martin Mundt, Yong Won Hong, Iuliia Pliushch, and Visvanathan Ramesh. 2020. A wholistic view of continual learning with deep neural networks: Forgotten lessons and the bridge to active and open world learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.01797*.
- Kishore Papineni, Salim Roukos, Todd Ward, and Wei-Jing Zhu. 2002. [Bleu: a method for automatic evaluation of machine translation](#). In *Proceedings of the 40th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 311–318, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- German I Parisi, Ronald Kemker, Jose L Part, Christopher Kanan, and Stefan Wermter. 2019. Continual lifelong learning with neural networks: A review. *Neural Networks*, 113:54–71.
- Baolin Peng, Chunyuan Li, Jinchao Li, Shahin Shayan-deh, Lars Liden, and Jianfeng Gao. 2020. Soloist: Few-shot task-oriented dialog with a single pre-trained auto-regressive model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.05298*.
- Abhinav Rastogi, Xiaoxue Zang, Srinivas Sunkara, Raghav Gupta, and Pranav Khaitan. 2019. Towards scalable multi-domain conversational agents: The schema-guided dialogue dataset. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.05855*.
- Andrei A Rusu, Neil C Rabinowitz, Guillaume Desjardins, Hubert Soyer, James Kirkpatrick, Koray Kavukcuoglu, Razvan Pascanu, and Raia Hadsell. 2016. Progressive neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.04671*.
- Kurt Shuster, Jack Urbanek, Emily Dinan, Arthur Szlam, and Jason Weston. 2020. Deploying lifelong open-domain dialogue learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2008.08076*.
- Pablo Sprechmann, Siddhant M Jayakumar, Jack W Rae, Alexander Pritzel, Adria Puigdomenech Badia, Benigno Uria, Oriol Vinyals, Demis Hassabis, Razvan Pascanu, and Charles Blundell. 2018. Memory-based parameter adaptation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.10542*.
- Fan-Keng Sun, Cheng-Hao Ho, and Hung-Yi Lee. 2019. Lamol: Language modeling for lifelong language learning. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Sebastian Thrun and Lorian Pratt. 2012. *Learning to learn*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2017. Attention is all you need. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 5998–6008.
- Zirui Wang, Sanket Vaibhav Mehta, Barnabás Póczos, and Jaime Carbonell. 2020. Efficient meta lifelong learning with limited memory. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.02500*.

Tsung-Hsien Wen, Milica Gasic, Nikola Mrksic, Pei-Hao Su, David Vandyke, and Steve Young. 2015. Semantically conditioned lstm-based natural language generation for spoken dialogue systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1508.01745*.

Mitchell Wortsman, Vivek Ramanujan, Rosanne Liu, Aniruddha Kembhavi, Mohammad Rastegari, Jason Yosinski, and Ali Farhadi. 2020. Supermasks in superposition. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33.

Chien-Sheng Wu, Andrea Madotto, Ehsan Hosseini-Asl, Caiming Xiong, Richard Socher, and Pascale Fung. 2019. Transferable multi-domain state generator for task-oriented dialogue systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.08743*.

Jaehong Yoon, Eunho Yang, Jeongtae Lee, and Sung Ju Hwang. 2017. Lifelong learning with dynamically expandable networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1708.01547*.

A Appendices

B Supplemental Material




Figure 6: Avg. Metric for the response generation, i.e., the BLUE and EER.

Method	+Parm.	Mem.	INTENT	DST	NLG	
			<i>Accuracy</i> $\uparrow$	<i>JGA</i> $\uparrow$	<i>EER</i> $\downarrow$	<i>BLEU</i> $\uparrow$
<u>VANILLA</u>	-	$\emptyset$	3.27 ± 0.3	5.34 ± 4.4	14.81 ± 7.7	11.06 ± 2.9
<u>L2</u>	$ \theta $	$\emptyset$	3.52 ± 0.7	4.95 ± 4.4	12.93 ± 5.5	11.99 ± 1.4
<u>EWC</u>	$2 \theta $	$\emptyset$	3.21 ± 0.3	5.36 ± 4.3	14.2 ± 6.2	11.19 ± 2.4
<u>AGEM</u>	-	$t M $	9.74 ± 2.6	5.17 ± 4.0	34.2 ± 8.6	5.51 ± 2.1
<u>LAMOL</u>	-	$\emptyset$	3.73 ± 1.0	4.03 ± 3.9	29.61 ± 3.1	5.42 ± 1.7
<u>REPLAY</u>	-	$t M $	76.45 ± 1.5	39.42 ± 0.2	4.95 ± 1.5	21.72 ± 0.3
<u>ADAPT</u>	$t \mu $	$\emptyset$	85.05 ± 0.6	37.9 ± 0.6	14.36 ± 0.7	21.48 ± 0.2
<u>MULTI</u>	-	-	87.50 ± 0.2	50.04 ± 0.1	2.84 ± 0.2	26.15 ± 0.2

Table 3: Results Modularized

$ \mathcal{M} $	INTENT	DST	NLG	
	<i>Accuracy</i> $\uparrow$	<i>JGA</i> $\uparrow$	<i>EER</i> $\downarrow$	<i>BLEU</i> $\uparrow$
10	57.286 ± 3.80	26.63 ± 1.26	8.44 ± 0.97	18.86 ± 0.68
50	76.446 ± 1.55	39.41 ± 0.28	6.63 ± 0.53	21.11 ± 0.41
100	81.496 ± 0.86	43.13 ± 0.31	5.75 ± 0.19	21.71 ± 0.25
500	85.91 ± 0.55	48.22 ± 0.53	4.96 ± 0.10	22.86 ± 0.25
ALL	87.784 ± 0.16	49.97 ± 0.46	4.36 ± 0.24	23.85 ± 0.12
MULTI	87.5 ± 0.1	50.04 ± 0.6	3.42 ± 0.1	26.15 ± 0.1

Table 4: Ablation study over episodic memory size $|\mathcal{M}|$. In the table $|\mathcal{M}|$ represent the number of samples per task kept in memory.

Domains	DST-INTENT			NLG			End-to-End		
	<i>Train</i>	<i>Dev</i>	<i>Test</i>	<i>Train</i>	<i>Dev</i>	<i>Test</i>	<i>Train</i>	<i>Dev</i>	<i>Test</i>
<u>TM19 movie</u>	4733	584	500	3010	366	341	12766	1632	1481
<u>TM19 auto</u>	3897	448	522	2128	223	283	10918	1248	1443
<u>TM19 restaurant</u>	4434	568	561	2582	330	333	12862	1669	1630
<u>TM19 pizza</u>	2883	381	359	1326	171	171	8720	1145	1083
<u>TM19 uber</u>	4378	535	525	2418	290	278	11331	1362	1361
<u>TM19 coffee</u>	2591	302	335	1381	151	184	7429	894	936
<u>TM20 flight</u>	15868	1974	1940	10148	1272	1245	36778	4579	4569
<u>TM20 food-ordering</u>	3404	411	431	2394	277	287	7838	941	986
<u>TM20 hotel</u>	15029	1908	1960	6590	842	869	35022	4400	4532
<u>TM20 music</u>	5917	764	769	4196	537	523	13723	1773	1787
<u>TM20 restaurant</u>	13738	1761	1691	8356	1063	994	34560	4398	4297
<u>TM20 sport</u>	13072	1668	1654	12044	1553	1542	29391	3765	3723
<u>TM20 movie</u>	13221	1703	1567	9406	1203	1093	32423	4158	3881
<u>MWOZ taxi</u>	1239	234	194	402	71	56	2478	468	388
<u>MWOZ train</u>	1452	158	160	563	63	59	2905	316	320
<u>MWOZ restaurant</u>	5227	243	281	3333	141	177	10461	486	563
<u>MWOZ hotel</u>	2798	289	385	1924	194	258	5602	579	771
<u>MWOZ attraction</u>	484	43	42	295	27	26	975	86	85
<u>sgd restaurants</u>	2686	278	616	1720	166	386	5756	606	1354
<u>sgd media</u>	1411	230	458	988	167	324	3114	502	1005
<u>sgd events</u>	4881	598	989	3241	389	590	10555	1317	2197
<u>sgd music</u>	1892	275	556	1506	224	464	4040	597	1215
<u>sgd movies</u>	1665	181	52	996	114	44	3760	420	126
<u>sgd flights</u>	4766	1041	1756	2571	627	982	10429	2244	3833
<u>sgd ridesharing</u>	652	85	187	377	48	107	1448	188	418
<u>sgd rentalcars</u>	1510	250	469	865	153	280	3277	538	1009
<u>sgd buses</u>	1862	331	653	1102	218	412	4050	709	1393
<u>sgd hotels</u>	3237	394	948	1997	243	597	6983	858	2053
<u>sgd services</u>	3328	360	926	2225	230	611	7262	803	2016
<u>sgd homes</u>	2098	170	533	1312	96	338	4519	394	1158
<u>sgd banks</u>	1188	139	293	723	84	181	2599	319	667
<u>sgd calendar</u>	592	115	236	397	65	133	1313	246	501
<u>sgd alarm</u>	212	34	91	221	30	74	580	82	198
<u>sgd weather</u>	196	32	80	123	23	59	433	70	169
<u>sgd travel</u>	186	23	48	121	14	30	420	53	106
<u>sgd payment</u>	227	21	51	143	14	32	497	44	113
<u>sgd trains</u>	300	73	128	149	43	66	668	158	274
Total	147254	18604	22946	93273	11722	14429	347885	44047	53641

Table 5: All data-samples used in the experiments




Figure 7: Modularized results




Figure 8: Ablation study on the size of the episodic-memory vs the intent accuracy.





Figure 9: Ablation study on the size of the episodic-memory vs BLEU/EER.




Figure 10: No Free Lunch in CL. This plot the trade-off between number of parameters added per task and the size of the episodic memory $\mathcal{M}$.